arXiv:1609.08975v1 [math-ph] 28 Sep 2016

FROM OBSERVABLES AND STATES TO HILBERT SPACE AND BACK: A 2-CATEGORICAL ADJUNCTION

ARTHUR J. PARZYGNAT

Abstract. Given a representation of a C^*-algebra, thought of as an abstract collection of physical observables, together with a normalized vector, one obtains a state on the algebra via restriction. This construction is functorial with respect to alterations of the algebra, two special cases of which are symmetries and inclusions. We show that this restriction has a left adjoint given by the Gelfand-Naimark-Segal (GNS) construction. Although, such an adjoint does not exist in an ordinary category, it does in a suitable 2-category. Every mathematical definition and result is followed by a physical interpretation.

Contents

1. Introduction and outline 1
2. States and representations of C^*-algebras 3
3. The GNS construction: from observables and states to Hilbert spaces 6
4. Some comments on the category of states 13
5. A right adjoint to the GNS construction 14
6. Examples 25
Appendix A. 2-categorical preliminaries 28
Acknowledgments 34
Index of notation 34
References 35

1. Introduction and outline

There is a familiar construction whose input consists of a representation of a C^*-algebra on a Hilbert space together with a unit vector and whose output is a state on the C^*-algebra via restriction. Namely, given an algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a representation $\pi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ to bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$, and a unit vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, one obtains a state on $\mathcal{A}$ given by the expectation values of observables in $\mathcal{A}$ sending $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to $\langle \psi, \pi(a)\psi \rangle$. We show that this construction, denoted by **rest**, can be expressed categorically as a

Key words and phrases. States on C^*-algebras, GNS construction, algebraic quantum theory, category theory.

natural transformation

(1.1)


Here, **Cat** is the category of categories, **C*-Alg** is the category of C^*-algebras, **States** is the functor that associates a category of states to every C^*-algebra, and $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet$ is the functor that associates the category of representations of C^*-algebras (the $\bullet$ is to denote the additional choice of a unit vector).

Our main purpose here is to prove that the natural transformation **rest** has a left-adjoint

(1.2)


denoted by $\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet$ since its ingredients are composed of constructions due to Gelfand, Naimark, and Segal [1], [2]. However, there are subtleties in this description. First, the GNS construction is a 2-categorical natural transformation (utilizing the fact that **Cat** is a 2-category) instead of a natural transformation in the usual sense of ordinary category theory [3]. Second, the category of states is not the naive one that one might think of—one must view the states of a C^*-algebra as a discrete category. Third, for a robust statement with physical applications, the morphisms in the representation category associated to a C^*-algebra must include all intertwiners that are isometries and not only the unitary equivalences.

The GNS construction has many useful and interesting properties. We isolate the key properties that can be used to characterize it as the left adjoint to the restriction map from representations to states. By the essential uniqueness of adjoints, this offers a *definition* of the GNS construction so that one can now view the GNS construction as exhibiting the existence of such an adjoint. Several of the ingredients used in this characterization were known for a long time. Here, however, we offer a categorical perspective together with interpretations of all results in physical terms.

The outline of this paper is as follows. Section 2 defines all relevant notions from C^*-algebras as well as the states functor and the representation functor. Section 3 describes the GNS construction as is usually found in the literature but from a more categorical perspective. For simplicity, we ignore the cyclic vector and focus only on the fact that the GNS construction produces a representation. In particular, we prove that the GNS construction is a semi-pseudo-natural transformation (though not a natural transformation) in Theorem 3.22. Section 4 explains why the category of states (introduced in Section 2) must have no non-trivial morphisms for our purposes. Section 5 properly accounts for the fact that the GNS construction produces a *cyclic* representation. The statement

that the GNS construction is left-adjoint to the restriction to states natural transformation is proved in Theorem 5.63. Definition 5.69 gives a categorical definition for the GNS construction motivated by our results. A summary of our results characterizing the GNS construction is given after this definition. In Section 6, we illustrate several of the constructions and results in terms of a simple example of a bipartite system familiar (to physicists) from the EPR setup. Throughout, we provide physical interpretations of most results. Although we assume the reader is familiar with some basics of category theory [3], we include a short appendix on 2-categories and 2-categorical adjunctions.

2. States and representations of C^*-algebras

For more details on C^*-algebras, the reader is referred to [4].

Definition 2.1. A *unital Banach algebra* is a vector space $\mathcal{A}$ together with

i) a binary multiplication operation $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$,
ii) a norm $\| \cdot \| : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, and
iii) an element $1_{\mathcal{A}} \in \mathcal{A}$.

The multiplication must be distributive over vector addition, the element $1_{\mathcal{A}}$ must satisfy the condition $a1_{\mathcal{A}} = 1_{\mathcal{A}}a = a$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and finally, all Cauchy sequences must converge.

Definition 2.2. A *unital C^*-algebra* is a unital Banach algebra $\mathcal{A}$ with an involution $^* : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ that is an anti-homomorphism for the multiplication and satisfies $\|aa^*\| = \|a\|^2$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. An element $a \in \mathcal{A}$ is *self-adjoint* if $a^* = a$, an *isometry* if $a^*a = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$, and *unitary* if $a^*a = 1_{\mathcal{A}} = aa^*$.

Definition 2.3. Let $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$ be two unital C^*-algebras. A *map/morphism of unital C^*-algebras* from $\mathcal{A}'$ to $\mathcal{A}$ is a bounded linear map $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that $f(a'^*) = f(a')^*$, $f(a'_1 a'_2) = f(a'_1)f(a'_2)$, and $f(1_{\mathcal{A}'}) = 1_{\mathcal{A}}$ for all $a', a'_1, a'_2 \in \mathcal{A}'$.

Definition 2.4. Let **C*-Alg** be the category of unital C^*-algebras. Namely, the objects of **C*-Alg** are unital C^*-algebras and the morphisms are maps of unital C^*-algebras.

Throughout this article, *all* C^*-algebras and their morphisms will be assumed unital and we will avoid overuse of this adjective unless it is necessary to stress it.

Definition 2.5. Given a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, a *state* on $\mathcal{A}$ is a bounded linear function $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ such that $\omega(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1$ and $\omega(a^*a) \geq 0$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Denote the set of states on a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ by $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$.[1]

Definition 2.6. Let $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ be the category of representations of the C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ on Hilbert spaces. This means the objects are pairs $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ with $\mathcal{H}$ a Hilbert space and $\pi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ a map of C^*-algebras. Here $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is the algebra of bounded operators

[1] $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ is more than just a set—it is a convex set. We will study the consequences of this in future work. This extra condition does not affect any of our results.

on $\mathcal{H}$—the involution on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ is taking the adjoint. Morphisms $(\pi, \mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow (\pi', \mathcal{H}')$ are intertwiners, i.e. bounded linear operators $L : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ such that

$$L \circ \pi(a) = \pi'(a) \circ L \quad \text{for all } a \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{2.7}$$

Remark 2.8. It is very important that we assume the morphisms in $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ are intertwiners and not necessarily just unitary isomorphisms. This will allow for a wider range of operations that occur in physics as will be explained later.

Physics 2.9. We think of a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ as the algebra of observables of a physical system.[2] An example to relate to is the case $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ of bounded operators on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$. However, the main point of this abstract perspective is to place the emphasis on the observables rather than the Hilbert space of vector states or the particular realization of an abstract observable as an operator. For example, we can think of angular momentum being defined in different ways on different Hilbert spaces (or even classically on phase space), but when we think of angular momentum, we do not think of which Hilbert space it acts on—we just think angular momentum!

Furthermore, we do not measure vectors in a Hilbert space. What we measure are expectation values. This is precisely the meaning of a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as defined above. A state assigns an expectation value to each physical observable. That is what a physical state is: a sequence of expectation values for all our observables (satisfying reasonable postulates). For instance, if a is self-adjoint, then $\omega(a)$ is the expectation value of a and $\omega(a^2) - (\omega(a))^2$ is the variance. Therefore, the definition of state includes not only expectation values of observables, but also their moments.

Of course, technically thinking of observables as an algebra is an idealization because observables (as described by the *working* physicist) are not always bounded operators and therefore they do not form an algebra in the strict sense. We will ignore this issue and consider observables that correspond to bounded operators.

The above definitions of $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ extend to functors.

Proposition 2.10. *The assignment sending a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$ and sending a morphism $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras to $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}') \xleftarrow{\mathcal{S}(f)} \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$, where $\mathcal{S}(f)$ is defined by*

$$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}) \ni \omega \mapsto \omega \circ f \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}'), \tag{2.11}$$

defines a functor[3]

$$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{Set}, \tag{2.12}$$

henceforth referred to as the states pre-sheaf.

[2] Actually, $\mathcal{A}$ contains un-observable operators because it contains elements that are not self-adjoint. Examples include creation and annihilation operators. In fact, it contains observables that are self-adjoint but need not be things we can actually measure in a lab (such as momentum to the 8^{th} power). Nevertheless, we call $\mathcal{A}$ the algebra of observables by slight abuse of terminology.

[3] For any category $\mathcal{C}$, the *opposite category* $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$ has the same objects as $\mathcal{C}$ but a morphism from an object a to an object b in $\mathcal{C}^{\mathrm{op}}$ is a morphism from b to a in $\mathcal{C}$. Also, **Set** is the category of sets.

Proof. First, $\omega \circ f$ is a state on $\mathcal{A}'$ because

$$\omega\big(f(1_{\mathcal{A}'})\big) = \omega(1_{\mathcal{A}}) = 1 \tag{2.13}$$

and

$$\omega\big(f(a'^* a')\big) = \omega\big(f(a')^* f(a')\big) \geq 0 \tag{2.14}$$

for all $a' \in \mathcal{A}'$. $\mathcal{S}$ is functorial because the identity $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ gets sent to the identity and the composition of C^*-algebra maps $\mathcal{A}'' \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ gets sent to $\mathcal{S}(f \circ f') = \mathcal{S}(f') \circ \mathcal{S}(f)$.[4] ■

Physics 2.15. The meaning of this functor physically can be understood by considering a special case, which will be used throughout this work. Suppose $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a subalgebra of physical observables of $\mathcal{A}$. Let $i : \mathcal{A}_0 \hookrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ be the inclusion map. The functor $\mathcal{S}(i)$ takes a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that gave expectation values for all observables in $\mathcal{A}$ and it *restricts* that state to only give expectation values for a smaller collection of observables, mathematically described by $\mathcal{A}_0$. In thermodynamic or statistical-mechanical terminology, one can imagine $\mathcal{A}$ as describing the algebra of observables for *microstates* and $\mathcal{A}_0$ as describing the set of observables for some *macrostates*.[5] In fact, Jaynes used a closely related idea, that is actually more physically reasonable, by assuming that $\mathcal{A}_0$ is just a sub*set* of $\mathcal{A}$ and develops thermodynamics from it [5]. In this process of restricting to a subalgebra, one therefore loses some information about the state—we only know fewer of its expectation values.

There is a functor $\mathcal{D} : \mathbf{Set} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$ from the category of sets to the category of categories given by sending a set to the discrete category with only identity morphisms. More precisely, a set X gets sent to the category $\mathcal{D}(X)$ whose set of objects is X and whose set of morphisms consists only of identities. A function $f : X \longrightarrow Y$ of sets gets sent to the functor $\mathcal{D}(f) : \mathcal{D}(X) \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}(Y)$ whose value on objects agrees with f. This determines $\mathcal{D}(f)$. Thus, since the composition of functors is a functor, this gives a functor

$$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{S}} \mathbf{Set} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{D}} \mathbf{Cat}, \tag{2.16}$$

which we denote by **States** and call it the *states pre-stack*. The categorically-minded reader will immediately point out that **Cat** is actually a 2-category, and we will indeed use this fact in a crucial way when we describe the GNS construction. But for now, let us put this aside.

[4] The flipping of the order of morphism composition in the equation $\mathcal{S}(f \circ f') = \mathcal{S}(f') \circ \mathcal{S}(f)$ is why we use op in $\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}$. This is sometimes referred to as an anti-homomorphism property or contravariance as opposed to covariance.

[5] I would like to thank V. P. Nair for discussions on these points.

Proposition 2.17. *The assignment*[6]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{Rep}} \mathbf{Cat} \\ \mathcal{A} &\mapsto \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \Big(\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}\Big) &\mapsto \Big(\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}') \xleftarrow{\mathbf{Rep}(f)} \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})\Big), \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

is a functor. Here $\mathbf{Rep}(f)$*, sometimes written as* f^**, is the functor defined by sending a representation* $(\pi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{H})$ *to the representation* $(\pi \circ f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}), \mathcal{H})$ *and by sending an intertwiner* $(\pi, \mathcal{H}) \xrightarrow{L} (\rho, \mathcal{V})$ *to the intertwiner* $(\pi \circ f, \mathcal{H}) \xrightarrow{L} (\rho \circ f, \mathcal{V})$.[7] **Rep** *is also called the* representation pre-stack*.*

Proof. Let us first make sure $\mathbf{Rep}(f)$ itself is indeed a functor. For L to be an intertwiner in $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}')$, it must be that

$$L \circ \pi\Big(f(a')\Big) = \rho\Big(f(a')\Big) \circ L \tag{2.19}$$

for all $a' \in \mathcal{A}'$. This is true because $f(a') \in \mathcal{A}$ and L is an intertwiner in $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$. It is not difficult to see that $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$ gets sent to $\mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})}$ and the composition of $\mathcal{A}'' \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ gets sent to $\mathbf{Rep}(f') \circ \mathbf{Rep}(f)$. ∎

Physics 2.20. The meaning of the functor (2.18) is as follows. With each abstract algebra of observables, there is a collection of Hilbert spaces on which we can realize these observables. This collection is not just a *set*[8] but a *category* because there are intertwiners between representations. If you think you do not care about intertwiners, think again. Every tensor operator is an intertwiner. For instance, the angular momentum for particles in three-dimensional space is a *vector* of operators. This vector of operators is precisely an intertwiner [6]. Other examples of intertwiners are unitary equivalences of representations. These are (some of the) symmetries of quantum mechanics. For instance, different observers might associate a slightly different Hilbert space to a collection of observables. In particular, the observables themselves might be expressed differently. The position and momentum representations of basic quantum mechanics provide one example. The unitary map defined by the Fourier transform is an intertwiner (a unitary equivalence) of representations. The category of representations conveniently packages all of these structures together in a single mathematical entity.

3. The GNS construction: from observables and states to Hilbert spaces

We will split the GNS construction into three parts. First, we will describe the construction as is common in the literature. Then we will describe something that is less

[6] In the second line of (2.18), the assignment on objects is described. In the third line, the assignment on morphisms is specified. We will often use this notation to specify functors.

[7] The same notation L is used because it is the same operator $L : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{V}$ at the level of Hilbert spaces.

[8] Technically, it is not even a set in the strict sense, but that is not the point I am trying to make.

commonly illustrated, and is described nicely for physicists in [7], which is what the GNS construction gives for C^*-algebra morphisms (and not necessarily just C^*-algebra *iso*morphisms). The GNS construction was first introduced by Segal in [2] and we will utilize many of the facts proved in this work. At the end of this section, we state our first theorem which says that the GNS construction is a semi-pseudo-natural transformation (see Definition A.1 in the Appendix) between the functors introduced in the previous section.

Construction 3.1. Let $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a state on a unital C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$. Then the function

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} &\longrightarrow \mathbb{C} \\ (b, a) &\mapsto \omega(b^* a) \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

is a bilinear map that is skew-conjugate in the first variable. Furthermore, it satisfies[9]

$$\omega(b^* a) = \overline{\omega(a^* b)} \qquad \forall\ a, b \in \mathcal{A} \tag{3.3}$$

and[10]

$$|\omega(b^* a)|^2 \leq \omega(b^* b)\omega(a^* a) \qquad \forall\ a, b \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{3.4}$$

Define the set of *null-vectors* by

$$\mathcal{N}_\omega := \{x \in \mathcal{A} \mid \omega(x^* x) = 0\}. \tag{3.5}$$

From (3.4), it follows that

$$|\omega(a^* x)|^2 \leq \omega(a^* a)\underbrace{\omega(x^* x)}_{0} = 0 \implies \omega(a^* x) = 0 \quad \forall\ a \in \mathcal{A},\ x \in \mathcal{N}_\omega. \tag{3.6}$$

Using this fact,

$$\omega\big((ax)^*(ax)\big) = \omega(x^* a^* a x) = \omega\big((a^* a x)^* x\big) = 0 \quad \forall\ a \in \mathcal{A},\ x \in \mathcal{N}_\omega, \tag{3.7}$$

which shows that $\mathcal{N}_\omega$ is a left ideal inside $\mathcal{A}$, meaning that $ax \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$ whenever $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $x \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$. Furthermore, note that (3.3) and (3.6) imply

$$\omega(x^* a) = 0 \quad \forall\ x \in \mathcal{N}_\omega,\ a \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{3.8}$$

[9]Proof: By assumption $\omega\big((\alpha a + \beta b)^*(\alpha a + \beta b)\big) \geq 0$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$, which in particular implies that $\omega\big((\alpha a + \beta b)^*(\alpha a + \beta b)\big)$ is real. Equating this expression with its conjugate gives $\overline{\alpha}\beta\omega(a^* b) + \alpha\overline{\beta}\omega(b^* a) = \alpha\overline{\beta}\overline{\omega(a^* b)} + \overline{\alpha}\beta\overline{\omega(b^* a)}$. Setting $\alpha = \sqrt{-1}$ and $\beta = 1$ gives $-\omega(a^* b) + \omega(b^* a) = \overline{\omega(a^* b)} - \overline{\omega(b^* a)}$ while setting $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = 1$ gives $\omega(a^* b) + \omega(b^* a) = \overline{\omega(a^* b)} + \overline{\omega(b^* a)}$. Adding these two gives $2\omega(b^* a) = 2\overline{\omega(a^* b)}$, which proves the claim.

[10]Proof (this is more or less a standard proof of the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality): This splits up into two cases. First, if $\omega(b^* a) = 0$, then the claim is true. In the other case, suppose that $\omega(b^* a) \neq 0$. As in the previous footnote, consider the inequality $\omega\big((\alpha a + \beta b)^*(\alpha a + \beta b)\big) \geq 0$ valid for all $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ and $a, b \in \mathcal{A}$. Choose $\alpha = \frac{|\omega(b^* a)|}{\omega(b^* a)}\sqrt{\omega(b^* b)}$ and $\beta = -\sqrt{\omega(a^* a)}$. Then, $\omega\big((\alpha a + \beta b)^*(\alpha a + \beta b)\big) = 2\omega(b^* b)\omega(a^* a) - 2|\omega(b^* a)|\sqrt{\omega(b^* b)\omega(a^* a)}$ using (3.3) along the way to cancel some terms. Rearranging and canceling the factor of 2 gives $|\omega(b^* a)|\sqrt{\omega(b^* b)\omega(a^* a)} \leq \omega(b^* b)\omega(a^* a)$. Squaring both sides and canceling the common terms proves the claim.

Now, denote the quotient vector space by

$$\mathcal{H}_\omega := \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_\omega, \tag{3.9}$$

write the equivalence class of $a \in \mathcal{A}$ as $[a]$, and define an inner product

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_\omega \times \mathcal{H}_\omega &\xrightarrow{\langle\, \cdot\, ,\, \cdot\, \rangle_\omega} \mathcal{H}_\omega \\ ([b],[a]) &\mapsto \omega(b^*a) \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

by choosing lifts of the equivalence classes. Note that this is well-defined because for any other choice b' and a' of $[b]$ and $[a]$, respectively, so that $b-b', a-a' \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$,

$$\begin{aligned} \omega(b'^*a') &= \omega\Big(\big(b-(b-b')\big)^*\big(a-(a-a')\big)\Big) \\ &= \omega(b^*a) - \omega\Big((b-b')^*a\Big) - \omega\Big(b^*(a-a')\Big) + \omega\Big((b-b')^*(a-a')\Big) \\ &= \omega(b^*a) - 0 - 0 + 0 \quad \text{by (3.6) and (3.8)} \\ &= \omega(b^*a). \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

Complete $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ with respect to the norm induced by $\langle\, \cdot\, ,\, \cdot\, \rangle_\omega$ and use the same notation $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ to denote this Hilbert space. There is a natural representation π_ω of $\mathcal{A}$ on $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ given by[11]

$$\pi_\omega(a)[b] := [ab] \tag{3.12}$$

for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $[b] \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$. Thus, associated to every state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, we have constructed a representation $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega)$ of $\mathcal{A}$. We denote this assignment by $\mathbf{GNS}_\mathcal{A} : \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$, i.e. $\mathbf{GNS}_\mathcal{A}(\omega) := (\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega)$. It is automatically a functor because $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ has no non-trivial morphisms. This construction is called the *GNS construction* for $\mathcal{A}$.

Physics 3.13. As we discussed earlier, a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a list of expectation values of all the observables of interest described by $\mathcal{A}$. As a particular example, consider again the case where $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ for a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with inner product $\langle\, \cdot\, ,\, \cdot\, \rangle$. Then, there is actually a one-to-one correspondence between states $\omega : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ satisfying a certain condition[12] and density matrices, i.e. bounded linear operators $\rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ that are self-adjoint and $\mathrm{tr}(\rho) = 1$ (see Proposition 19.8 and Theorem 19.9 of [8]). The correspondence is obtained by the map that sends a density matrix ρ to the state ω_ρ defined by $\omega_\rho(a) := \mathrm{tr}(\rho a)$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$. Therefore, we will *think* of an abstract state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ as being equivalent to a density matrix.[13] This example will help us interpret the GNS construction physically. The meaning of the function $(b, a) \mapsto \omega(b^*a)$ for two

[11] This is well-defined because for any other $b' \in \mathcal{A}$ with $[b'] = [b]$, $ab' - ab = a(b'-b) \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$ because $b'-b \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$ and $\mathcal{N}_\omega$ is an ideal by the comment preceding (3.6).

[12] If $\dim \mathcal{H} < \infty$, no such additional condition is necessary. However, in the case $\dim \mathcal{H} = \infty$, one needs stronger continuity assumptions on the state.

[13] Though in many cases of interest, such a density matrix need not exist. This occurs for instance in the Unruh effect whereupon restricting the algebra of observables to a Rindler observer does not lead to a density matrix, but rather an abstract state satisfying the KMS condition (see Section 5.1 of Wald [9]).

observables a and b in $\mathcal{A}$ is less mysterious if we focus on the case $b = a$ and think of a and a^* as annihilation and creation operators, respectively. Then a^*a is the number operator and $\omega(a^*a)$ is the expectation value of the particle number for the state ω.

The meaning of the null-space $\mathcal{N}_\omega$ can be interpreted as the set of observables that annihilate the state ω for all observable purposes. If we go back to the case $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ and the special case of $\rho = P_\psi$ (written as $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ in Dirac notation), the projection operator onto the subspace spanned by a unit vector $\psi \in \mathcal{H}$, then for an observable $a \in \mathcal{A}$ to be in $\mathcal{N}_\omega$ would mean that $\mathrm{tr}(P_\psi a^* a) = \langle a\psi, a\psi\rangle = 0$, which, since $\langle\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,\rangle$ is an inner product, would mean that $a\psi = 0$, i.e. a annihilates ψ. So now consider two observables $b, c \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $b - c \in \mathcal{N}_\omega$. This means that $(b-c)\psi = 0$, i.e. $b\psi = c\psi$, which means that the observables b and c cannot be distinguished by the particular state ψ. Therefore, to summarize, if we fix a state ω on a set of observables $\mathcal{A}$, it may be that with respect to that particular state, there are some observables that are indistinguishable in terms of their expectation values. That is why we consider the quotient $\mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_\omega$ where we have identified these equivalent observables. Therefore, the GNS construction tells us that the associated Hilbert space is just equivalence classes of observables of $\mathcal{A}$ distinguished by the state ω.

Construction 3.14. Let $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ be a morphism of C^*-algebras and let $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a state on $\mathcal{A}$. Then, as discussed in Proposition 2.10, $\omega \circ f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is a state on $\mathcal{A}'$. By applying the previous construction, we get two representations $\pi_{\omega\circ f} : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f})$ and $\pi_\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ with $\pi_{\omega\circ f}$ a representation of $\mathcal{A}'$ and π_ω a representation of $\mathcal{A}$. There is a canonical map $L_f : \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ obtained from the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}' & \xrightarrow{\quad f \quad} & \mathcal{A} \\ \downarrow & & \downarrow \\ \mathcal{A}'/\mathcal{N}_{\omega\circ f} = \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f} & \xrightarrow[L_f]{} & \mathcal{H}_\omega = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_\omega \end{array} \tag{3.15}$$

given by

$$L_f([a']) := [f(a')] \tag{3.16}$$

for all $[a'] \in \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}$. This is well-defined because for any other representative b' of $[a']$,[14]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & (\omega\circ f)\Big((b'-a')^*(b'-a')\Big) & \\ \overset{\text{since } b'-a'\in\mathcal{N}_{\omega\circ f}}{\swarrow} & & \overset{\text{by Def'n 2.3}}{\searrow} \\ 0 & & \omega\Big(f\big((b'-a')^*\big)f(b'-a')\Big) \\ & & \overset{\text{by Def'n 2.3}}{\searrow} \\ & \omega\Big(\big(f(b')-f(a')\big)^*\big(f(b')-f(a')\big)\Big) & \end{array} \tag{3.17}$$

[14]Diagrams such as (3.17) are read from top to bottom in either clockwise or counterclockwise order to replicate the argument in the order in which it was originally conceived.

i.e. $f(b')-f(a')\in\mathcal{N}_\omega$ and hence $f(a')$ is equivalent to $f(b')$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Furthermore, the map L_f is an intertwiner $(\pi_{\omega\circ f},\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f})\longrightarrow(\pi_\omega\circ f,\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ of representations of $\mathcal{A}'$, which means that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f} & \xrightarrow{L_f} & \mathcal{H}_\omega \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_{\omega\circ f}(a')}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi_\omega\left(f(a')\right)} \\ \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f} & \xrightarrow[L_f]{} & \mathcal{H}_\omega\end{array} \tag{3.18}$$

commutes for all $a'\in\mathcal{A}'$. This is true because for any $[b']\in\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}$,

$$\begin{aligned} L_f\Big(\pi_{\omega\circ f}(a')\big([b']\big)\Big) &= L_f\big([a'b']\big) && \text{by (3.12) for } \pi_{\omega\circ f}\\ &= \big[f(a'b')\big] && \text{by (3.16)}\\ &= \big[f(a')f(b')\big] && \text{by Def'n 2.3}\\ &= \pi_\omega\Big(f(a')\Big)\big([f(b')]\big) && \text{by (3.12) for } \pi_\omega\\ &= \pi_\omega\big(f(a')\big)\Big(L_f\big([b']\big)\Big) && \text{by (3.16)}\end{aligned} \tag{3.19}$$

for all $a'\in\mathcal{A}'$. The assignment sending a state $\omega:\mathcal{A}\longrightarrow\mathbb{C}$ and a morphism $f:\mathcal{A}'\longrightarrow\mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras to the intertwiner $L_f:(\pi_{\omega\circ f},\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f})\longrightarrow(\pi_\omega\circ f,\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ of representations of $\mathcal{A}'$ therefore defines a natural transformation[15]

$$\begin{array}{ccc}\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \\ {\scriptstyle \mathbf{States}(f)}\downarrow & \overset{\mathbf{GNS}_f}{\swarrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{Rep}(f)} \\ \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}') & \xrightarrow[\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}'}]{} & \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}')\end{array} \tag{3.20}$$

associated to every morphism $f:\mathcal{A}'\longrightarrow\mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras. We denote the intertwiner L_f by $\mathbf{GNS}_f(\omega)$ to explicitly indicate what it depends on.

Physics 3.21. Let us go back to the case $i:\mathcal{A}_0\hookrightarrow\mathcal{A}$ of restricting ourselves to a subalgebra of observables and let ω be a state on $\mathcal{A}$. Let $\omega_0:=\omega\circ i$ be the state pulled back to $\mathcal{A}_0$. Then, since $\mathcal{A}_0$ is a subalgebra of $\mathcal{A}$, there are fewer experiments we can perform on the state and we conclude $\mathcal{N}_{\omega_0}\subset\mathcal{N}_\omega$, which means there are fewer indistinguishable observables for the state ω_0. This therefore alters what the state is because a state is characterized by its expectation values for some set of observables.

The associated intertwiner $L_i:(\pi_{\omega_0},\mathcal{H}_{\omega_0})\longrightarrow(\pi_\omega\circ i,\mathcal{H}_\omega)$ is an injection because if for any $[a_0]\in\mathcal{H}_{\omega_0}$ such that $L_i\big([a_0]\big)\equiv[i(a_0)]=0$ in $\mathcal{H}_\omega$, this means that $\omega\big(i(a_0)^*i(a_0)\big)=0$ but this also equals $(\omega\circ i)(a_0^*a_0)$, which exactly means $[a_0]=0$ in $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_0}$. Therefore,

[15]In the present situation, the definition of the natural transformation $\mathbf{GNS}_f$ reduces to an assignment on objects of $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ to morphisms of $\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}')$ because $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ is a discrete category.

physically, the intertwiner describes a subspace $L_i(\mathcal{H}_{\omega_0})$ of the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_\omega$. The act of restricting our view to a subalgebra corresponds to restricting to a subspace of our Hilbert space since the Hilbert space is described as equivalence classes of observables.[16]

Theorem 3.22. *The assignments*[17]

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}_0^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}} \mathbf{Cat}_1 \\ &\mathcal{A} \mapsto \Big(\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{3.23}$$

from Construction 3.1 and

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}_1^{\mathrm{op}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}} \mathbf{Cat}_2 \\ &\Big(\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}\Big) \mapsto \Big(\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}'} \circ \mathbf{States}(f) \xRightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}_f} \mathbf{Rep}(f) \circ \mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

from Construction 3.14 define a semi-pseudo-natural transformation[18]

$$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \;\; \underset{\mathbf{Rep}}{\overset{\mathbf{States}}{\overset{\Downarrow\,\mathbf{GNS}}{}}} \;\; \mathbf{Cat}\ . \tag{3.25}$$

Proof. There are only two things to check because $\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}$ has no nontrivial 2-morphisms (see Definition A.1). First, the GNS construction associated to the identity morphism $\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}$ for a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ gives $\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}}$ which is precisely the identity natural transformation $\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mathbf{States}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) = \mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}} \Rightarrow \mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathbf{Rep}(\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}) \circ \mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}$. Second, associated to a pair of composable morphisms

$$\mathcal{A}'' \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}, \tag{3.26}$$

there are two diagrams one obtains. On the one hand, applying the GNS construction to the composition $f \circ f'$ gives $\mathbf{GNS}_{f\circ f'}$. On the other hand, applying GNS to each f' and f and then composing gives another natural transformation. These two results look

[16]This phrasing is a bit misleading, however, since *every* C^*-algebra morphism $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ will lead to L_f being injective regardless of whether or not f is injective since our argument did not depend on this. Nevertheless, for psychological reasons and simplicity for interpretation, we will always use inclusions for explaining the physics.

[17]Given a 2-category (or a category) $\mathcal{C}$, the objects, 1-morphisms, and 2-morphisms are denoted by $\mathcal{C}_0$, $\mathcal{C}_1$, and $\mathcal{C}_2$, respectively.

[18]We are viewing **Cat** as a strict 2-category whose 2-morphisms are natural transformations. By also viewing $\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}$ as a 2-category (all of whose 2-morphisms are identities), we can view **States** and **Rep** as (strict) 2-functors. Because $\mathbf{GNS}_f$ is not invertible, which is usually required in the definition of a pseudo-natural transformation, we use the more general notion of semi-pseudo-natural transformation described in Definition A.1 of the Appendix.

like

(3.27)



respectively. The second condition that **GNS** be a semi-pseudo-natural transformation is that the compositions in these two diagrams are equal. This follows from the commutativity of the individual squares and triangles in the diagram

(3.28)



for any state ω on $\mathcal{A}$. ■

Physics 3.29. Semi-pseudo-naturality means the following if we restrict our attention to a subalgebra and then restrict to yet another subalgebra, as in

$$\mathcal{A}_1 \overset{j}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{A}_0 \overset{i}{\hookrightarrow} \mathcal{A}. \tag{3.30}$$

Equality of the two diagrams in (3.27) means that constructing the physical subspace $\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ i\circ j}$ of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ of quantum configurations for the state ω with respect to the subalgebra $\mathcal{A}_1$ is the same subspace obtained from first restricting to $\mathcal{A}_0$ and then to $\mathcal{A}_1$, i.e.

(3.31)



commutes, where we have used the notation from Construction 3.14.

Remark 3.32. In current terminology [10], this proves that the GNS construction is not only a functor for a fixed C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, but it is also a morphism of pre-stacks over the category of all C^*-algebras. Note that it is *not* a morphism of pre-sheaves of categories because the diagram in (3.20) does *not* commute (a condition that is required to have a

morphism of pre-sheaves). Instead, a natural transformation (which is a 2-morphism in **Cat**) is needed to compensate for the lack of commutativity, and this is why 2-categories play a crucial role in the GNS construction.

4. Some comments on the category of states

One would like to think of $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ as a category of states with non-trivial morphisms. Namely, a morphism from $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ to $\mu : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ consists of a C^*-algebra morphism $\phi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A} & \xrightarrow{\phi} & \mathcal{A} \\ & {\scriptstyle\omega}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\mu} & \\ & \mathbb{C} & \end{array} \tag{4.1}$$

commutes, i.e. $\mu \circ \phi = \omega$. Let us call this closely related category $\mathit{states}(\mathcal{A})$. While one can define a functor $\mathit{states}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$ as a special case of $\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}$ on objects and $\mathbf{GNS}_{\phi}$ on morphisms, this is too restrictive and not what we want in general because we also care about mappings of *different* algebras. Recall from Physics 2.15, that an injective C^*-algebra map $\mathcal{A}_0 \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ is supposed to be thought of as using macrostate observables described by $\mathcal{A}_0$ instead of microstate observables described by $\mathcal{A}$. To incorporate this, we would therefore still want to think of the different categories of states as a pre-sheaf of categories on the category of C^*-algebras, i.e. a functor $\mathit{states} : \mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \longrightarrow \mathbf{Cat}$. For a morphism $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ this should get mapped to a functor $\mathit{states}(f) : \mathit{states}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathit{states}(\mathcal{A}')$. How should this functor be defined? This agrees with $\mathbf{States}(f)$ at the level of objects. However, for a morphism $\phi : \omega \longrightarrow \mu$ of states in $\mathcal{A}$, all we have is the collection of morphisms

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{A}' & & & & \mathcal{A}' \\ & {\scriptstyle f}\searrow & & \swarrow{\scriptstyle f} & \\ & & \mathcal{A} \xrightarrow{\phi} \mathcal{A} & & \\ & & {\scriptstyle\omega}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\mu} & & \\ & & \mathbb{C} & & \end{array} \tag{4.2}$$

From these data we are supposed to produce a map of C^*-algebras $\phi' : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}'$ such that the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{A}' & \xrightarrow{\phi'} & \mathcal{A}' \\ & {\scriptstyle\omega\circ f}\searrow \quad \swarrow{\scriptstyle\mu\circ f} & \\ & \mathbb{C} & \end{array} \tag{4.3}$$

commutes. One can show that the only such maps $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras for which we can do this in a functorial manner are C^*-algebra *isomorphisms*. Since we specifically

do not want this for physical reasons, we use the discrete category $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ instead of the more reasonable, yet naive, category $\mathscr{states}(\mathcal{A})$.

5. A right adjoint to the GNS construction

Besides producing a representation $(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ given a state ω on $\mathcal{A}$, the GNS construction also produces a cyclic vector in $\mathcal{H}_\omega$. This fact will let us construct a sort of inverse to the GNS construction provided that we include this extra datum in the definition of the semi-pseudo-natural transformation **GNS**.

Definition 5.1. A *cyclic vector* Ω for a representation π of a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ on a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ is a normalized vector $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ such that

$$\{\pi(a)\Omega \ : \ a \in \mathcal{A}\} \tag{5.2}$$

is a dense subset in $\mathcal{H}$ (with respect to the norm induced by the inner product on $\mathcal{H}$). A representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ together with a cyclic vector Ω is called a *cyclic representation* and is written as a triple $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$. A representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ together with a normalized vector (not necessarily cyclic) is called a *pointed representation*.

The reason for demanding normalized vectors in the above definition is so that they produce states, as will be explained shortly.

Physics 5.3. When $\mathcal{A}$ is the algebra of observables for a quantum field theory (in a particular phase), the vacuum vector/state is typically a cyclic vector (any particle content state is obtained by creation operators on the ground state). When a representation is irreducible, every non-zero vector is cyclic (by using annihilation operators, one can get to the ground state).

Definition 5.4. Let $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ be the category of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$. Namely, an object of $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ is a pointed representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ and a morphism from $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ to $(\pi', \mathcal{H}', \Omega')$ is an intertwiner $L : \mathcal{H} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}'$ of representations of $\mathcal{A}$ such that

$$L(\Omega) = \Omega' \qquad \& \qquad L^*L = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{5.5}$$

Let $\mathbf{Rep}^\odot(\mathcal{A})$ be the sub-category of $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ of cyclic representations of $\mathcal{A}$.

Proof. Some things must be checked so that the above definition is in fact valid. For instance, let

$$(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{L} (\pi', \mathcal{H}', \Omega') \xrightarrow{L'} (\pi'', \mathcal{H}'', \Omega'') \tag{5.6}$$

be a pair of composable morphisms. Then the composition $L'L$ satisfies

$$(L'L)^*(L'L) = L^*L'^*L'L = L^*L = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}}. \tag{5.7}$$

Associativity follows from associativity of composition of functions. The other axioms of a category all hold. ∎

Remark 5.8. $\mathbf{Rep}^\odot(\mathcal{A})$ is a fully faithful subcategory of $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$ because a vector being cyclic is a property and not additional structure.

Remark 5.9. Condition (5.5) says that L is an isometry and is, in particular, injective. We do *not* require L to be unitary, which would require $LL^* = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}'}$ as well. Note that if $L : (\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \longrightarrow (\pi', \mathcal{H}', \Omega')$ is a morphism of cyclic representations, then L sends a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}$ to a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}'$ because $L(\Omega) = \Omega'$. Therefore, in this case, L is almost surjective (it is surjective onto a dense subset). Furthermore, the number of morphisms between any two pointed representations is quite small: there is either one or none at all.

Construction 5.10. Let $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ be a pointed representation of a C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$. The vector Ω defines a state ω_Ω on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$ by the formula[19]

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \ni B \mapsto \omega_\Omega(B) := \langle \Omega, B\Omega \rangle. \tag{5.11}$$

Pulling this state back to $\mathcal{A}$ along π defines a state $\omega_\Omega \circ \pi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on $\mathcal{A}$. This state is also more appropriately denoted by $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ for "restriction."

Remark 5.12. If the vector Ω were not required to be normalized, but merely nonzero, then one could still define a state by the assignment

$$\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \ni B \mapsto \frac{\langle \Omega, B\Omega \rangle}{\langle \Omega, \Omega \rangle}. \tag{5.13}$$

Nevertheless, such an assignment would spoil other desirable properties that will be discussed shortly.

Lemma 5.14. *Let $L : (\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \longrightarrow (\pi', \mathcal{H}', \Omega')$ be a morphism of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$. Then,*

$$\omega_{\Omega'} \circ \pi' = \omega_\Omega \circ \pi, \tag{5.15}$$

i.e. the two states $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ and $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi', \mathcal{H}', \Omega')\big)$ are equal.

Proof. For any $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Omega', \pi'(a)\Omega' \rangle &= \langle L(\Omega), \pi'(a)L(\Omega) \rangle && \text{by (5.4)} \\ &= \langle L(\Omega), L\pi(a)\Omega \rangle && \text{by (2.7)} \\ &= \langle \Omega, L^*L\pi(a)\Omega \rangle && \text{by Def'n of } L^* \\ &= \langle \Omega, \pi(a)\Omega \rangle && \text{by (5.4).} \end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

■

Physics 5.17. Imagine a context in which we begin with a Hilbert space and a pure vacuum state Ω. Given a subalgebra $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$, the construction $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}$ restricts the vacuum state to a state on this subalgebra. This is useful if we can only make measurements of certain observables. For instance, a Rindler observer has a restricted algebra of observables so that restricting a Minkowski vacuum state to their algebra results in a thermal state, a phenomenon known as the Unruh effect [9]. If we change our representation in such a way that the two are still related by an intertwiner satisfying (5.5), then

[19] Here $\langle \cdot\,, \cdot \rangle$ is the inner product on $\mathcal{H}$.

we get the *same* state. $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}$ is also a natural construction from the physics perspective since every normalized vector in $\mathcal{H}$ gives a state on any C^*-subalgebra of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. What is not obvious is that there is a canonical way to go back—the purpose of this section is to make this statement precise and prove that the GNS construction achieves this.

Proposition 5.18. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra. The assignment*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})_0 \ni (\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega) &\mapsto \omega_\Omega\circ\pi \in \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})_0 \\ \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})_1 \ni \Big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\xrightarrow{L}(\pi',\mathcal{H}',\Omega')\Big) &\mapsto \mathrm{id}_{\omega_\Omega\circ\pi} \in \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})_1 \end{aligned} \tag{5.19}$$

from Construction 5.10 defines a functor $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$.

Proof. This follows directly from Construction 5.10 and Lemma 5.14. ∎

Construction 5.20. Let $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ be a morphism of C^*-algebras. The induced functor $\mathbf{Rep}(f) : \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A}')$ extends to a functor $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(f) : \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}')$ as follows. Let $(\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ be a pointed representation of $\mathcal{A}$. Then this gets sent to $(\pi\circ f,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$. Note that even if $(\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ is a cyclic representation, $(\pi\circ f,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ is *not* necessarily a cyclic representation of $\mathcal{A}'$ since

$$\big\{\pi\big(f(a')\big)\Omega \;:\; a'\in\mathcal{A}'\big\} \tag{5.21}$$

is not necessarily dense in $\mathcal{H}$. Nevertheless, $(\pi\circ f,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ *is* a pointed representation. A morphism of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$ gets sent to a morphism of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}'$ under the functor $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(f)$ using the same intertwiner. In fact, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(f)} & & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{States}(f)} \\ \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}') & \xrightarrow[\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}'}]{} & \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}') \end{array} \tag{5.22}$$

commutes.

This proves the following fact.

Proposition 5.23. **rest**, *as defined in Construction 5.10, is a natural transformation*[20]

$$\mathbf{C}^*\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \;\underset{\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet}{\overset{\mathbf{States}}{\Rightarrow}}\; \mathbf{Cat}\ . \tag{5.24}$$

We will now modify the GNS construction to include the construction of a cyclic vector. Due to the similarity of this construction and that of Constructions 3.1 and 3.14, we will skip many details and only focus on the new ones.

[20]This is special case of a pseudo-natural transformation since $\mathbf{rest}_f = \mathrm{id}$ in (5.22).

Construction 5.25. For every C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, define a functor

$$\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}) \tag{5.26}$$

by the following assignment. To a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$, assign the cyclic representation[21] $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) := (\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}])$. Because $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ has no non-trivial morphisms, this defines a functor. Furthermore, the image of this functor actually lands in the subcategory $\mathbf{Rep}^{\odot}(\mathcal{A})$ [2]. To every morphism $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ of unital C^*-algebras, define a natural transformation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}) \\ {\scriptstyle \mathbf{States}(f)}\downarrow & \swarrow\!\!\swarrow \; {\scriptstyle \mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{f}} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(f)} \\ \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}') & \xrightarrow[\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}'}]{} & \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}') \end{array} \tag{5.27}$$

as follows. To every state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on $\mathcal{A}$ define the morphism

$$\big(\pi_{\omega\circ f}, \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}, [1_{\mathcal{A}'}]\big) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{f}(\omega)} \big(\pi_\omega \circ f, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big) \tag{5.28}$$

of pointed representations to be exactly the same as L_f as in (3.16) and simply note that a property of this linear map is that

$$L_f([1_{\mathcal{A}'}]) = [f(1_{\mathcal{A}'})] = [1_{\mathcal{A}}] \tag{5.29}$$

since f is a morphism of *unital* C^*-algebras. We need to check that L_f also satisfies $L_f^* L_f = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}}$. This follows from the calculation

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \big\langle L_f([a']), L_f([b']) \big\rangle_{\omega} & \\ \text{by Def'n of } L_f^* \swarrow\!\!\swarrow & & \text{by (3.16)} \searrow\!\!\searrow \\ \big\langle [a'], L_f^* L_f([b']) \big\rangle_{\omega\circ f} & & \big\langle [f(a')], [f(b')] \big\rangle_{\omega} \\ & & \Big\| \text{ by (3.10)} \\ \big\langle [a'], [b'] \big\rangle_{\omega\circ f} & & \omega\big(f(a')^* f(b')\big) \\ \text{by (3.10)} \searrow\!\!\searrow & \omega\big(f(a'^* b')\big) & \swarrow\!\!\swarrow \text{ by Def'n 2.3} \end{array} \tag{5.30}$$

valid for all $a', b' \in \mathcal{A}'$. Going clockwise from the top proves that L_f preserves the inner-product while going counterclockwise from the top is simply the definition of the adjoint L_f^* of the operator L_f. By Riesz's theorem (see Theorem A.52 in [8] for instance) and

[21] $[1_{\mathcal{A}}]$ is a cyclic vector because $\{\pi_\omega(a)[1_{\mathcal{A}}] = [a] \mid a \in \mathcal{A}\} = \mathcal{A}/\mathcal{N}_\omega$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ by definition.

the fact that $\{[a'] : a' \in \mathcal{A}'\}$ is a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}$, the right-hand-side of the inner product is unique, i.e.

$$L_f^* L_f\big([b']\big) = [b']. \tag{5.31}$$

Remark 5.32. Note that although $\big(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big)$ and $\big(\pi_{\omega\circ f}, \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}, [1_{\mathcal{A}'}]\big)$ are cyclic representations of $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{A}'$, respectively, the pointed representation $\big(\pi_\omega \circ f, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big)$ of $\mathcal{A}'$ obtained by restriction by f is *not* necessarily cyclic. This is why the target of the GNS functor was chosen to be the category of pointed representations instead of cyclic representations. This is analogous to the fact that the restriction of an irreducible representation to a subalgebra need not be irreducible.

Theorem 5.33. *The assignments*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}_0^{\mathrm{op}} &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet} \mathbf{Cat}_1 \\ \mathcal{A} &\mapsto \Big(\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.34}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}_1^{\mathrm{op}} &\xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet} \mathbf{Cat}_2 \\ \Big(\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}\Big) &\mapsto \Big(\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}'} \circ \mathbf{States}(f) \xRightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_f} \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(f) \circ \mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}\Big) \end{aligned} \tag{5.35}$$

from Construction 5.25 define a semi-pseudo-natural transformation

$$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \;\; \underset{\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet}{\overset{\mathbf{States}}{\Downarrow \mathbf{GNS}^\bullet}} \;\; \mathbf{Cat}\,. \tag{5.36}$$

Proof. The proof is not much different than what it was for **GNS**. ∎

There is one last construction we must confront. This involves relating the composition of semi-pseudo-natural transformations **rest** and $\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet$ with the identity natural transformation.

Lemma 5.37. *The vertical composition*

$$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} \;\; \underset{\mathbf{rest}\Downarrow}{\overset{\mathbf{States}}{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet\Downarrow}} \;\; \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet \;\; \mathbf{Cat} \;\; \mathbf{States} \tag{5.38}$$

of pseudo-natural transformations is equal to the identity natural transformation.

Proof. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a C^*-algebra. The composition acting on a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}} \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \\ &\omega \longmapsto \big(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big) \mapsto \big\langle [1_{\mathcal{A}}], \pi_\omega(\,\cdot\,)[1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big\rangle_\omega \,. \end{aligned} \tag{5.39}$$

$\big\langle [1_{\mathcal{A}}], \pi_\omega(\,\cdot\,)[1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big\rangle_\omega$ agrees with ω as a state because

$$\big\langle [1_{\mathcal{A}}], \pi_\omega(a)[1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big\rangle_\omega = \big\langle [1_{\mathcal{A}}], [a]\big\rangle = \omega(1^*_{\mathcal{A}} a) = \omega(a) \quad \forall\, a \in \mathcal{A}. \tag{5.40}$$

There are no non-trivial morphisms in $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ so the composition is the identity functor. To every morphism $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras, the composition of natural transformations

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}} & \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) \\ \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{States}(f)} & \overset{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_f}{\swarrow} & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(f)} & \overset{\mathrm{id}=\mathbf{rest}_f}{\swarrow} & \Big\downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathbf{States}(f)} \\ \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}') & \xrightarrow[\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}'}]{} & \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}') & \xrightarrow[\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}'}]{} & \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}') \end{array} \tag{5.41}$$

must equal the identity natural transformation. This follows from Lemma 5.14 and the fact that $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ has no non-trivial morphisms: both of the outer functors give the same state $\omega \circ f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ from the state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$. ■

However, the composition in the order

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet & & \\ & \overset{\mathbf{rest}}{\swarrow} & & \overset{\mathbf{rest}}{\searrow} & \\ \mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{States}} & & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{States}} & \mathbf{Cat} \\ & \underset{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet}{\searrow} & & \underset{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet}{\swarrow} & \\ & & \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet & & \end{array} \tag{5.42}$$

is certainly not the identity. In the following, we construct the required modification (see Definition A.10 in the Appendix).

Construction 5.43. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a unital C^*-algebra and consider the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} & \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A}) & \\ \overset{\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}}{\nearrow} & & \overset{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}}{\searrow} \\ \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) & \xrightarrow[\mathrm{id}_{\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})}]{} & \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A}) \end{array} \tag{5.44}$$

of functors. Recalling the notation from Constructions 5.10 and 3.1, observe what happens to a pointed representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ of $\mathcal{A}$ along the top two functors

$$(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \xrightarrow{\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}} \big\langle \Omega, \pi(\,\cdot\,)\Omega\big\rangle \equiv \omega_\Omega \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{\mathcal{A}}} \big(\pi_{\omega_\Omega}, \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}, [1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big) \tag{5.45}$$

Therefore, we have two pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$ satisfying

$$\langle \Omega, \pi(a)\Omega\rangle = \big\langle [1_{\mathcal{A}}], \pi_{\omega_\Omega}(a)[1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big\rangle_{\omega_\Omega} \qquad \text{for all } a\in\mathcal{A}. \tag{5.46}$$

If $(\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ was *also* a cyclic representation, then it was already known by Segal that any other cyclic representation restricting to the same state is unitarily equivalent to it [2]. For reference, we illustrate Segal's proof for our special case. Define the unitary intertwiner

$$\begin{aligned} \big(\pi_{\omega_\Omega},\mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega},[1_{\mathcal{A}}]\big) &\xrightarrow{\quad m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)\quad} (\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega) \\ \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}\ni[a] &\longmapsto \pi(a)\Omega\in\mathcal{H} \end{aligned}. \tag{5.47}$$

To see that this is well-defined, let $a'\in\mathcal{A}$ be another representative of $[a]$. Then for all $b\in\mathcal{A}$,

$$\langle \pi(b)\Omega, \pi(a-a')\Omega\rangle = \omega_\Omega\big(b^*(a-a')\big) = 0. \tag{5.48}$$

Since $\{\pi(b)\Omega : b\in\mathcal{A}\}$ is dense in $\mathcal{H}$ (since $(\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ is assumed cyclic for now) and $\langle\,\cdot\,,\,\cdot\,\rangle_{\omega_\Omega}$ is non-degenerate, $\pi(a-a')\Omega=0$, i.e. $\pi(a')\Omega=\pi(a)\Omega$, which proves well-definedness. Next, $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)$ is an intertwiner if the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega} & \xrightarrow{\quad m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)\quad} & \mathcal{H} \\ {\scriptstyle \pi_{\omega_\Omega}(a')}\downarrow & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \pi(a')} \\ \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega} & \xrightarrow[\quad m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)\quad]{} & \mathcal{H} \end{array} \tag{5.49}$$

commutes for all $a'\in\mathcal{A}$. Following the image of an element $[a]\in\mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}$ along both of these morphisms gives[22]

$$\begin{array}{ccc} m_{\mathcal{A}}\big(\pi_{\omega_\Omega}(a')[a]\big) & & \pi(a')m_{\mathcal{A}}\big([a]\big) \\ \text{by (3.12)}\ \big\downarrow & & \big\downarrow\ \text{by (5.47)} \\ m_{\mathcal{A}}\big([a'a]\big) & & \pi(a')\pi(a)\Omega \\ \text{by (5.47)}\ \big\searrow & & \big\swarrow \\ & \pi(a'a)\Omega & \end{array} \tag{5.50}$$

proving that the diagram indeed commutes. To see that $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)$ is unitary, notice that it is isometric from a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}$ onto a dense subset of $\mathcal{H}$ (by Remark 5.9) because

$$\big\langle m_{\mathcal{A}}\big([a]\big), m_{\mathcal{A}}\big([b]\big)\big\rangle = \big\langle \pi(a)\Omega,\pi(b)\Omega\big\rangle = \omega_\Omega(a^*b) = \big\langle [a],[b]\big\rangle_{\omega_\Omega} \tag{5.51}$$

[22]We have abusively written $m_{\mathcal{A}}([a])$ instead of $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)\big)([a])$ because the notation would be too difficult to read otherwise. Since our representation $(\pi,\mathcal{H},\Omega)$ is fixed for now, this should cause no confusion. This same abuse of notation is done in (5.51).

for all $[a], [b] \in \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}$. In more detail, since $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is bounded (since it is an isometry, its norm is one) on a dense domain, there exists a unique extension to the completion. Since $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is an isometry, this extension is also an isometry. Since the image of $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is dense, this extension is unitary.

Unfortunately, however, $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ is in general *not* a cyclic representation but is only a pointed representation of $\mathcal{A}$. As a result, $\{\pi(b)\Omega : b \in \mathcal{A}\}$ is not dense in $\mathcal{H}$ and the above argument fails. Fortunately, there is another (simpler) argument that does not require cyclicity. The map (5.47) is *still* a well-defined intertwiner satisfying (5.5) even if $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ is not cyclic. To see this, let a' be another representative of $[a]$. Then $a - a' \in \mathcal{N}_{\omega_\Omega}$ which means, by definition, that $\omega_\Omega\big((a-a')^*(a-a')\big) = 0$. Meanwhile,

$$\omega_\Omega\big((a-a')^*(a-a')\big) = \big\langle \Omega, \pi(a-a')^*\pi(a-a')\Omega\big\rangle = \big\langle \pi(a-a')\Omega, \pi(a-a')\Omega\big\rangle. \tag{5.52}$$

Since $\langle \cdot\,,\,\cdot\,\rangle$ is an inner product, this holds if and only if $\pi(a-a')\Omega = 0$ and so $\pi(a)\Omega = \pi(a')\Omega$ and well-definedness of $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ in (5.47) still holds. The same argument as above in (5.50) proves that $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ is an intertwiner of $\mathcal{A}$-representations. Although the image of $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ is no longer necessarily dense, $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ is still an isometry onto its image by the same argument as in (5.51). Hence,

$$m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)^* m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega}} \tag{5.53}$$

proving that $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ is a morphism in $\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$.

Remark 5.54. If in the definition of a pointed representation we use arbitrary vectors instead of normalized ones, and we define $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ to be the state

$$\frac{\langle \Omega, \pi(\,\cdot\,)\Omega\rangle}{\langle \Omega, \Omega\rangle}, \tag{5.55}$$

then the map (5.47) cannot be an isometry.

Physics 5.56. The map $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ tells us that if we start with an arbitrary representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H})$ of the algebra of observables $\mathcal{A}$ together with a normalized vector state $\Omega \in \mathcal{H}$ (our representation need not be irreducible because our vector state need not be cyclic), if we forget about our Hilbert space, and remember only the algebra of observables and our state, then we might not be able to recover our exact Hilbert space back, but we can get close. The best we can do from the GNS construction is to get a new Hilbert space that embeds into the Hilbert space we started with via $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$. Furthermore, in this subspace, the vector state we started with becomes cyclic with respect to the algebra of observables. In other words, we lose some information, namely the vectors orthogonal to this subspace, but we keep many of the essential features of our initial state.

Lemma 5.57. *m from Construction 5.43 defines a modification (recall Definition A.10)*

(5.58)



via the assignment

(5.59)

$$\mathbf{C}^*\text{-}\mathbf{Alg}_0 \ni \mathcal{A} \longmapsto$$



.

Furthermore, for each C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, the natural transformation $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is vertically invertible when restricted to the subcategory $\mathbf{Rep}^{\odot}(\mathcal{A})$,

Proof. In order for m to be a modification, for every morphism $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras, the following equality must hold (see equation (A.14))

(5.60)



i.e. for every object $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ of $\mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})$, the diagram

(5.61)



of intertwiners of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}'$ must commute. The image of a vector $[a'] \in \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\Omega \circ f}$ under the top two linear maps is $\pi\big(f(a')\big)\Omega$ while the image under the bottom map is $(\pi \circ f)(a')\Omega$. These are equal elements in $\mathcal{H}$. Because the maps agree on a dense domain, the diagram (5.61) commutes. Finally, when $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is restricted to the subcategory $\mathbf{Rep}^{\odot}(\mathcal{A})$, it was shown in Construction (5.43) that $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is unitary and hence $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ is a vertically invertible natural transformation. ∎

Everything we have done up to this point leads to the following theorem encompassing the GNS construction. To state it, we introduce the functor 2-category (see Definition A.23).

Definition 5.62. Let $\mathbf{Fun}(\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Cat})$ be the 2-category whose objects are functors from $\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}$ to $\mathbf{Cat}$, 1-morphisms are semi-pseudo-natural transformations, and 2-morphisms are modifications (see the Appendix for definitions).

Theorem 5.63. *The semi-pseudo-natural transformation* $\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet : \mathbf{States} \Rightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet$ *is left-adjoint to* $\mathbf{rest}$. *In fact, the quadruple* $(\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet, \mathbf{rest}, \mathrm{id}, m)$ *is an adjunction in* $\mathbf{Fun}(\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}, \mathbf{Cat})$.

Proof. The only thing left to check are the zig-zag identities from Lemma A.24. Using the notation from that lemma, $F := \mathbf{States}$, $G := \mathbf{Rep}^\bullet$, $\sigma := \mathbf{GNS}^\bullet$, $\rho := \mathbf{rest}$, $\eta := \mathrm{id}$, and $\epsilon := m$. By Remark A.27, it suffices to prove

(5.64)



and

(5.65)



for each object $\mathcal{A}$ of $\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}^{\mathrm{op}}$. Fortunately, these identities are essentially tautologous. For (5.64), since $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ has no non-trivial morphisms, the equality holds. For (5.65), it suffices to check what happens to a state ω. Under the composition in (5.65), ω gets sent to

$$\omega \mapsto \big(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_\mathcal{A}]\big) \mapsto \big\langle [1_\mathcal{A}], \pi_\omega(\,\cdot\,)[1_\mathcal{A}]\big\rangle = \omega \mapsto \big(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_\mathcal{A}]\big), \tag{5.66}$$

which is exactly the same representation as in the second step. Finally, $m_\mathcal{A}\big((\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_\mathcal{A}])\big)$ is the identity intertwiner because it sends $[a] \in \mathcal{H}_\omega$ to $\pi(a)[1_\mathcal{A}]$ by (5.47) but $\pi(a)[1_\mathcal{A}] = [a]$ by (3.12). ∎

In particular, by Remark A.27, this theorem implies the following.

Corollary 5.67. *For every C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$, the quadruple $\left(\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathrm{id}, m_{\mathcal{A}}\right)$ is an adjunction (in the usual sense).*

This means that for every state $\omega \in \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})_0$ and pointed representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \in \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0$, there is a natural bijection of morphisms[23]

$$\mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})\Big(\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega), (\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\Big) \cong \mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})\Big(\omega, \mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\Big), \tag{5.68}$$

which illustrates in what sense the GNS construction $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)$ is optimal: for every other choice of representation $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ on which to realize the state ω as a vector state, there is always a (unique) isometric intertwiner from the GNS Hilbert space to $\mathcal{H}$. In particular, the GNS Hilbert space is the *smallest* space on which one can represent states as vector states. If the states do not agree, this result also says that there is *no* such intertwiner (since $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ is a discrete category). This can change if we have an isomorphism of our algebra.

A special case of the adjunction $\left(\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}, \mathrm{id}, m_{\mathcal{A}}\right)$ occurs when restricted to the category of cyclic representations of $\mathcal{A}$. In this case, it is an adjoint equivalence (meaning, an equivalence of categories). In other words, in the cyclic case, the categories $\mathbf{Rep}^{\odot}(\mathcal{A})$ and $\mathbf{States}(\mathcal{A})$ are equivalent and the restriction functor exhibits this equivalence with a canonical inverse given by the GNS construction. In particular, this reproduces the well-known result [2] that there is a one-to-one correspondence between isomorphism classes of cyclic representations of $\mathcal{A}$ and states on $\mathcal{A}$.

However, our general result also extends the adjunction in a functorial manner incorporating C^*-algebra morphisms (such as restrictions to subalgebras). For instance, recall from Construction 3.14 where $\mathbf{GNS}_f$ was defined given a morphism $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras. If we start with a state $\omega : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ on a C^*-algebra, we have an optimal way to obtain a Hilbert space representation $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega) = (\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}])$ with a realization of our state as a vector state. If we restrict this state to $\mathcal{A}'$, then we get a representation $(\pi \circ f, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [1_{\mathcal{A}}])$ in which the vector might no longer be cyclic. On the one hand, we can look at the subspace $\{[f(a')] : a' \in \mathcal{A}'\} \subset \mathcal{H}_\omega$ in which the vector $[1_{\mathcal{A}}]$ is cyclic. On the other hand, we can apply the GNS construction to the restricted state $\omega \circ f$ to get a new representation $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}'}(\omega \circ f) = (\pi_{\omega\circ f}, \mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f}, [1_{\mathcal{A}'}])$ in which the state is also realized as a cyclic vector. By earlier observations, there exists a unique map $\mathcal{H}_{\omega\circ f} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ sending $[1_{\mathcal{A}'}]$ to $[1_{\mathcal{A}}]$ defined by $[a'] \mapsto [f(a')]$ because it is densely defined. What is not immediately obvious is that this map is an isometry (see Physics 3.21 for a proof). Therefore, the two spaces are canonically isomorphic.

Our results can be summarized by saying that we can now provide a *definition* instead of a *construction* that produces, in a functorial manner, cyclic representations from states on C^*-algebras.

Definition 5.69. The *GNS construction* is the left-adjoint of **rest**.

[23] This is how one remembers that $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}$ is *left* adjoint to **rest**.

As a short summary, the GNS construction is characterized by the following data:

i) a function $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0$ for each C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ sending states on $\mathcal{A}$ to pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$,
ii) a function $\mathcal{G}_f : \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A}) \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A}')_1$ for each morphism $f : \mathcal{A}' \longrightarrow \mathcal{A}$ of C^*-algebras sending states on $\mathcal{A}$ to isometric intertwiners of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}'$, and
iii) a function $m_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_1$ for each C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$

subject to the following conditions:

(a) $\mathcal{G}_f(\omega)$ is an isometric intertwiner of representations of $\mathcal{A}'$ from $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}'}(\omega \circ f)$ to[24] $f^*\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)$ for all states $\omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$,
(b) $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ is a isometric intertwiner from $\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}\Big(\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)\Big)$ to $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$ for all pointed representations $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \in \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0$,
(c) $\mathcal{G}_{\mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{A}}} = i_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}$, where $i_{\mathcal{A}} : \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0 \longrightarrow \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_1$ is the map that assigns the identity intertwiner to each pointed representation,
(d) $\mathcal{G}_{f \circ f'}(\omega) = f'^*\big(\mathcal{G}_f(\omega)\big) \circ \mathcal{G}_{f'}(\omega \circ f)$ for all composable pairs of C^*-algebra morphisms $\mathcal{A}'' \xrightarrow{f'} \mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$ and states $\omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$,
(e) $f^* m_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big) \circ \mathcal{G}_f\Big(\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}\big((\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)\Big) = m_{\mathcal{A}'}\big((\pi \circ f, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)\big)$ for all pointed representations $(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega) \in \mathbf{Rep}^{\bullet}(\mathcal{A})_0$,
(f) $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}} \circ \mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}} = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})}$, and
(g) $m_{\mathcal{A}}\big(\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)\big) = \mathrm{id}_{\mathcal{G}_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)}$ for all states $\omega \in \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$.

The reader should compare this short definition to Constructions 3.1, 3.14, and 5.25, which are the usual definitions of the GNS construction.

6. Examples

The authors of [7] include several examples, and we will go through the simplest ones to illustrate the meaning of our constructions and theorems.

Example 6.1. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$, 2×2 matrices with complex coefficients. This is the algebra of observables for a spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ system, i.e. a qubit. Label an orthonormal basis by $\{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$—this basis refers to the spin of a particle along a particular axis. Let $\mathcal{A}$ act on $\mathbb{C}^2$ by the identity representation, meaning that the representation $\pi : \mathcal{A} \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is just the identity map. Let $\omega_\uparrow : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be the state corresponding to a pure state with spin up, i.e.[25] $\omega_\uparrow(a) = \langle\uparrow|a|\uparrow\rangle$ for all $a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H})$. Applying the restriction functor $\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to the pointed representation $\big(\pi, \mathbb{C}^2, |\uparrow\rangle\big)$ gives $\omega_\uparrow$. Next, apply the GNS construction $\mathbf{GNS}^{\bullet}_{\mathcal{A}}$ to the state $\omega_\uparrow$. As a vector space, $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ is four-dimensional, with a basis given by

$$e_{\uparrow\uparrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{\uparrow\downarrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad e_{\downarrow\uparrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \& \quad e_{\downarrow\downarrow} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.2}$$

[24] Here, f^* is the pullback of a representation along the map f.
[25] We are using Dirac bra-ket notation for the examples.

The expectation values for these operators are given by

$$\omega_\uparrow(e_{\uparrow\uparrow}) = 1, \quad \omega_\uparrow(e_{\uparrow\downarrow}) = 0, \quad \omega_\uparrow(e_{\downarrow\uparrow}) = 0, \quad \& \quad \omega_\uparrow(e_{\downarrow\downarrow}) = 0. \tag{6.3}$$

Notice that[26] $e^\dagger_{\uparrow\downarrow}e_{\uparrow\downarrow} = e_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ and $e^\dagger_{\downarrow\downarrow}e_{\downarrow\downarrow} = e_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ so that $\omega_\uparrow(e^\dagger_{\uparrow\downarrow}e_{\uparrow\downarrow}) = 0$ and $\omega_\uparrow(e^\dagger_{\downarrow\downarrow}e_{\downarrow\downarrow}) = 0$. In fact,

$$\mathcal{N}_{\omega_\uparrow} = \operatorname{span}\{e_{\uparrow\downarrow}, e_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}. \tag{6.4}$$

Then, $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_\uparrow} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)/\mathcal{N}_{\omega_\uparrow}$ consists of equivalence classes of matrices

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} a_{\uparrow\uparrow} & a_{\uparrow\downarrow} \\ a_{\downarrow\uparrow} & a_{\downarrow\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{6.5}$$

where $a_{ij} \in \mathbb{C}$ with $i, j \in \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ and $a \sim b$ if and only if

$$b - a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_{\uparrow\downarrow} - a_{\uparrow\downarrow} \\ 0 & b_{\uparrow\downarrow} - a_{\downarrow\downarrow} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{6.6}$$

The associated cyclic representation from the GNS construction applied to the state $\omega_\uparrow$ is $(\pi_{\omega_\uparrow}, \mathcal{H}_{\omega_\uparrow}, [\mathbb{1}])$, where $\mathbb{1}$ is the 2×2 identity matrix and $\pi_{\omega_\uparrow}(a)\big([b]\big) = [ab]$ is obtained from ordinary matrix multiplication. The intertwiner $m_{\mathcal{A}}$ from (5.47) applied to our representation $\big(\pi, \mathbb{C}^2, |\uparrow\rangle\big)$ is the map $[a] \mapsto a|\uparrow\rangle$. Since our representation was cyclic to begin with, this intertwiner is unitary. This map compares our original Hilbert space representation to the one obtained from the GNS construction in a canonical way.

Example 6.7. Let $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2)$ and let ω be the state corresponding to the pure state

$$|\Psi\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\Big) \tag{6.8}$$

where $|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ is short for $|\uparrow\rangle \otimes |\downarrow\rangle$. Using the same notation as in the previous example, this means

$$\begin{aligned}(a \otimes b)\Big(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\Big) &= a|\uparrow\rangle \otimes b|\downarrow\rangle - a|\downarrow\rangle \otimes b|\uparrow\rangle \\ &= \Big(a_{\uparrow\uparrow}|\uparrow\rangle + a_{\downarrow\uparrow}|\downarrow\rangle\Big) \otimes \Big(b_{\uparrow\downarrow}|\uparrow\rangle + b_{\downarrow\downarrow}|\downarrow\rangle\Big) \\ &\quad - \Big(a_{\uparrow\downarrow}|\uparrow\rangle + a_{\downarrow\downarrow}|\downarrow\rangle\Big) \otimes \Big(b_{\uparrow\uparrow}|\uparrow\rangle + b_{\downarrow\uparrow}|\downarrow\rangle\Big) \\ &= (a_{\uparrow\uparrow}b_{\uparrow\downarrow} - a_{\uparrow\downarrow}b_{\uparrow\uparrow})|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + (a_{\uparrow\uparrow}b_{\downarrow\downarrow} - a_{\uparrow\downarrow}b_{\downarrow\uparrow})|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \\ &\quad + (a_{\downarrow\uparrow}b_{\uparrow\downarrow} - a_{\downarrow\downarrow}b_{\uparrow\uparrow})|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle + (a_{\downarrow\uparrow}b_{\downarrow\downarrow} - a_{\downarrow\downarrow}b_{\downarrow\uparrow})|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle.\end{aligned} \tag{6.9}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\omega(a \otimes b) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(\langle\uparrow\downarrow| - \langle\downarrow\uparrow|\Big)(a \otimes b)\Big(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(a_{\uparrow\uparrow}b_{\downarrow\downarrow} - a_{\uparrow\downarrow}b_{\downarrow\uparrow} + a_{\downarrow\downarrow}b_{\downarrow\uparrow} - a_{\downarrow\uparrow}b_{\downarrow\downarrow}\Big).\end{aligned} \tag{6.10}$$

[26] To avoid confusion with the physics literature, for the purposes of this section, we will use † to denote the adjoint instead of *.

It is not necessary for us to calculate $\mathcal{H}_\omega$ explicitly. All that is important is that there is a unitary intertwiner

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \big(\pi_\omega, \mathcal{H}_\omega, [\mathbb{1}]\big) & \xrightarrow{m_{\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2)}} & \big(\pi, \mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2, |\Psi\rangle\big) \\ [a\otimes b] & \longmapsto & (a\otimes b)|\Psi\rangle \end{array} \tag{6.11}$$

extended linearly. Now, let $i_1 : \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2\otimes\mathbb{C}^2)$ be the map defined by

$$i_1(a) := a\otimes\mathbb{1}. \tag{6.12}$$

Physically, such a map corresponds to an observer $\mathcal{O}_1$ only being able to make measurements on the observables $\mathcal{B}(\mathbb{C}^2)$ corresponding to a single particle. It is convenient to denote the first $\mathbb{C}^2$ by $\mathcal{H}_1$ and the second by $\mathcal{H}_2$. This situation occurs, for instance, in an EPR-like experiment, where a particle decomposes into two with a corresponding state given by (6.8). The two particles fly off in opposite directions and observers far away are waiting to measure the spin.

$$\mathcal{O}_1 \xleftarrow{\quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\Big) \quad} \mathcal{O}_2$$

Observer $\mathcal{O}_1$ cannot measure the observables $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ and vice versa. Therefore, the state that $\mathcal{O}_1$ sees is given by the restriction

$$\omega_1 := \omega\circ i_1 : \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \longrightarrow \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1\otimes\mathcal{H}_2) \longrightarrow \mathbb{C}. \tag{6.13}$$

This state corresponds to the density matrix

$$\rho_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix} \tag{6.14}$$

using our ordered basis $(|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle)$. What is the GNS construction applied to such a state and how is it related to the original Hilbert space on which Ψ is defined? Let $a\in\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$. Then

$$\big(a^\dagger a\big)_{ik} = \sum_{j\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} (a^\dagger)_{ij}a_{jk} = \sum_{j\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} \overline{a}_{ji}a_{jk} \tag{6.15}$$

implies

$$\begin{aligned} \omega_1(a^\dagger a) = \mathrm{tr}(\rho_1 a^\dagger a) &= \frac{1}{2}\Big(\langle\uparrow|a^\dagger a|\uparrow\rangle + \langle\downarrow|a^\dagger a|\downarrow\rangle\Big) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}}\Big(|a_{j\uparrow}|^2 + |a_{j\downarrow}|^2\Big) = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,k\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} |a_{jk}|^2 \end{aligned} \tag{6.16}$$

so that $\omega_1(a^\dagger a) = 0$ if and only if $a = 0$. Therefore, $\mathcal{N}_{\omega_1} = 0$ and hence $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_1} = \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ as a Hilbert space. Furthermore, the associated GNS representation π_{ω_1} acts as

$$\pi_{\omega_1}(a)b = ab = \sum_{i,j,k\in\{\uparrow,\downarrow\}} a_{ij}b_{jk}e_{ik} \tag{6.17}$$

The induced map $L_{i_1} : \mathcal{H}_{\omega_1} \longrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\omega$ corresponding to (3.15) is given by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1) \equiv \mathcal{H}_{\omega_1} & \xrightarrow{L_{i_1}=\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{i_1}(\omega)} & \mathcal{H}_\omega \\ a & \longmapsto & [a \otimes \mathbb{1}] \end{array} \tag{6.18}$$

Using this with the intertwiner $m_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)}$ from (6.11), gives a canonical intertwiner of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$-representations to our original Hilbert space

$$\begin{array}{ccccc} \mathcal{H}_{\omega_1} & \xrightarrow{\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet_{i_1}(\omega)} & \mathcal{H}_\omega & \xrightarrow{i_1^*(m_{\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2)})} & \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 \\ a & \longmapsto & [a \otimes \mathbb{1}] & \longmapsto & (a \otimes \mathbb{1})|\Psi\rangle \end{array} . \tag{6.19}$$

This canonical map can also be thought of as the top arrow in the diagram (5.61). This exhibits our Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{\omega_1}$, which was the Hilbert space from the GNS construction associated to the EPR density matrix for observer $\mathcal{O}_1$, as a subspace of our original Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$ for the entangled EPR state $|\Psi\rangle$. In fact, the map (6.19) is a unitary map. This is because

$$(a \otimes \mathbb{1})|\Psi\rangle = -a_{\uparrow\downarrow}|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle + a_{\uparrow\uparrow}|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - a_{\downarrow\downarrow}|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle + a_{\downarrow\uparrow}|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle. \tag{6.20}$$

illustrating that the map is also surjective.

Appendix A. 2-categorical preliminaries

In the GNS construction, we use semi-pseudo-natural transformations, which are different from the pseudo-natural transformations that appear in the literature [11]. Fortunately, the difference is minor. For completeness, we include this definition along with the notion of modifications.

Definition A.1. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be two (strict)[27] 2-categories and let $F, G : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be two 2-functors. A *semi-pseudo-natural transformation* ρ from F to G, written as $\rho : F \Rightarrow G$, consists of the following data:

i) a function $\rho : C_0 \longrightarrow D_1$ assigning a 1-morphism in $\mathcal{D}$ to an object x in $\mathcal{C}$ in the following manner

$$\begin{array}{ccc} x & \xmapsto{\rho} & \begin{array}{c} F(x) \\ \downarrow \rho(x) \\ G(x) \end{array} \end{array} \tag{A.2}$$

[27] A definition exists for weak 2-categories and weak 2-functors but such a definition is not needed here.

ii) and a function $\rho : C_1 \longrightarrow D_2$ assigning a 2-morphism[28] in $\mathcal{D}$ to every 1-morphism $y \overset{\alpha}{\leftarrow} x$ in $\mathcal{C}$ in the following manner

(A.3)
$$y \xleftarrow{\ \alpha\ } x \qquad \overset{\rho}{\longmapsto} \qquad \begin{array}{ccc} F(y) & \xleftarrow{F(\alpha)} & F(x) \\ {\scriptstyle \rho(y)}\downarrow & \overset{\rho(\alpha)}{\searrow\!\!\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(x)} \\ G(y) & \underset{G(\alpha)}{\longleftarrow} & G(x) \end{array} .$$

These data must satisfy the following conditions.

(a) For every object x in $\mathcal{C}$,

(A.4)
$$\rho(\mathrm{id}_x) = \mathrm{id}_{\rho(x)}.$$

(b) For every pair $(z \overset{\alpha}{\leftarrow} y, y \overset{\beta}{\leftarrow} x)$ of composable 1-morphisms in $\mathcal{C}$, the diagram

(A.5)
$$\begin{array}{ccc} \rho(z)\circ F(\alpha)\circ F(\beta) & \overset{\rho(\alpha)\mathrm{id}_{F(\beta)}}{\Longrightarrow} & G(\alpha)\circ\rho(y)\circ F(\beta) \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}}\Vert & & \\ \rho(z)\circ F(\alpha\beta) & & \Vert{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}_{G(\alpha)}\circ\rho(\beta)} \\ {\scriptstyle \rho(\alpha\beta)}\Downarrow & & \\ G(\alpha\beta)\circ\rho(x) & \underset{\mathrm{id}}{=\!=} & G(\alpha)\circ G(\beta)\circ\rho(x) \end{array}$$

commutes, i.e.

(A.6)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} F(z) & \xleftarrow{F(\alpha)} & F(y) & \xleftarrow{F(\beta)} & F(x) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(z)} & \overset{\rho(\alpha)}{\searrow\!\!\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(y)} & \overset{\rho(\beta)}{\searrow\!\!\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(x)} \\ G(z) & \underset{G(\alpha)}{\longleftarrow} & G(y) & \underset{G(\beta)}{\longleftarrow} & G(x) \end{array} \quad = \quad \begin{array}{ccc} F(z) & \xleftarrow{F(\alpha\beta)} & F(x) \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(z)} & \overset{\rho(\alpha\beta)}{\searrow\!\!\searrow} & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \rho(x)} \\ G(z) & \underset{G(\alpha\beta)}{\longleftarrow} & G(x) \end{array} .$$

(c) For every 2-morphism

(A.7)
$$\begin{array}{ccccc} & & \overset{\alpha}{\curvearrowleft} & & \\ y & & \Downarrow\Sigma & & x \\ & & \underset{\gamma}{\curvearrowright} & & \end{array} ,$$

[28] In definitions in the literature, one often requires this 2-morphism to be vertically invertible, motivated by the fact that equations should replace isomorphisms upon categorification [12]. However, we see no good reason to force ourselves to this requirement if examples exist where no such isomorphism is available. Absolutely nothing else in the definition changes.

the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G(\alpha)\circ\rho(x) & \xleftarrow{\rho(\alpha)} & \rho(y)\circ F(\alpha) \\ {\scriptstyle G(\Sigma)\circ \mathrm{id}_{\rho(x)}}\Big\Downarrow & & \Big\Downarrow{\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}_{\rho(y)}\circ F(\Sigma)} \\ G(\gamma)\circ\rho(x) & \xleftarrow[\rho(\gamma)]{} & \rho(y)\circ F(\gamma) \end{array} \tag{A.8}$$

commutes, i.e.



(A.9)

The definition of a modification does not change if one uses semi-pseudo-natural transformations instead of pseudo-natural transformations.

Definition A.10. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be two 2-categories, $F, G : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$ be two 2-functors, and $\rho, \sigma : F \Rightarrow G$ be two semi-pseudo-natural transformations. A *modification* m from σ to ρ, written as $m : \sigma \Rrightarrow \rho$ and drawn as



(A.11)

consists of a function $m : C_0 \longrightarrow D_2$ assigning a 2-morphism in $\mathcal{D}$ to an object x in $\mathcal{C}$ in the following manner



(A.12)

This assignment must satisfy the condition that for every 1-morphism $y \xleftarrow{\alpha} x$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} G(\alpha)\circ\sigma(x) & \xleftarrow{\sigma(\alpha)} & \sigma(y)\circ F(\alpha) \\ {\scriptstyle \mathrm{id}_{G(\alpha)}m(x)}\Big\Downarrow & & \Big\Downarrow{\scriptstyle m(y)\mathrm{id}_{F(\alpha)}} \\ G(\alpha)\circ\rho(x) & \xleftarrow[\rho(\alpha)]{} & \rho(y)\circ F(\alpha) \end{array} \tag{A.13}$$

commutes, i.e.

(A.14) 

Compositions of semi-pseudo-natural transformations and modifications are not changed as a result of these alterations to the usual definitions.

Definition A.15. Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a (strict) 2-category. An *adjunction* in $\mathcal{C}$ consists of a pair of objects x, y in $\mathcal{C}$, a pair of morphisms

(A.16) $$x \underset{g}{\overset{f}{\rightleftarrows}} y$$

and a pair of 2-morphisms

(A.17) 

satisfying

(A.18) 

and

(A.19) 

Conditions (A.18) and (A.19) are known as the *zig-zag identities*. An adjunction as above is typically written as a quadruple (f, g, η, ϵ) and we say f is *left-adjoint* to g and write $f \dashv g$.

A left adjoint is unique in the following sense.

Lemma A.20. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ be a (strict) 2-category and let x and y be two objects in $\mathcal{C}$. Let $x \overset{g}{\leftarrow} y$ be a 1-morphism and let (f, g, η, ϵ) and $(f', g, \eta', \epsilon')$ be adjunctions in which which f and f' are both left-adjoint to g. Then there exists a vertically invertible 2-morphism $\sigma : f \Rightarrow f'$ such that*

(A.21)



and

(A.22)



In this paper, we focus on an adjunction in a particular 2-category obtained from functors between 2-categories.

Definition A.23. Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be two (strict) 2-categories. Let $\mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ be the 2-category whose objects are (strict) functors from $\mathcal{C}$ to $\mathcal{D}$, 1-morphisms are semi-pseudo-natural transformations, and 2-morphisms are modifications.

We spell out what it means to have an adjunction in this 2-category explicitly.

Lemma A.24. *Let $\mathcal{C}$ and $\mathcal{D}$ be two (strict) 2-categories and let $\mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ be the functor 2-category described in Definition (A.23). An adjunction in $\mathbf{Fun}(\mathcal{C}, \mathcal{D})$ consists of two (strict) functors $F, G : \mathcal{C} \longrightarrow \mathcal{D}$, two semi-pseudo-natural transformations $\sigma : F \Rightarrow G$ and $\rho : G \Rightarrow F$, and two modifications $\eta : \mathrm{id}_F \Rrightarrow {}^{\sigma}_{\rho}$ and $\epsilon : {}^{\rho}_{\sigma} \Rrightarrow \mathrm{id}_G$ such that the diagrams*

(A.25)

both commute, i.e.

(A.26)



respectively.

Remark A.27. Because the zig-zag identities only involve the equality of modifications, and since the datum of a modification consists only of an assignment of 2-morphisms in $\mathcal{D}$ to objects of $\mathcal{C}$, they can be re-expressed as

(A.28)



and

(A.29)



for every object x of $\mathcal{C}$, i.e. for every object x in $\mathcal{C}$, the quadruple $\big(\sigma(x), \rho(x), \eta(x), \epsilon(x)\big)$ is an adjunction.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank V. P. Nair for helpful conversations and for bringing my attention to [7], which was the seed of the ideas in this work. Amol Deshmukh and Dennis Sullivan convinced me to read [5], which has offered additional insight to these ideas. I would also like to thank Masoud Khalkhali for bringing a few errors to my attention and Scott O. Wilson for several helpful suggestions. The majority of this work was completed when the author was at the City College of New York and the CUNY Graduate Center and is part of the author's Ph.D. thesis. Work by this author was partially supported by the CUNY Graduate Center Capelloni Dissertation Fellowship and NSF grant PHY-1213380.

Index of notation

Notation	Name/description	Location	Page
$\mathcal{A}$	unital C^*-algebra	Def'n 2.2	3
$\mathbf{C^*\text{-}Alg}$	category of unital C^*-algebras	Def'n 2.4	3
ω	a state (on some C^*-algebra)	Def'n 2.5	3
$\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{A})$	set of states on $\mathcal{A}$	Def'n 2.5	3
$\mathbf{Rep}(\mathcal{A})$	category of representations of $\mathcal{A}$	Def'n 2.6	3
$\mathcal{S}$	states pre-sheaf	Prop 2.10	4
$\mathbf{States}$	states pre-stack	Eqn (2.16)	5
$\mathbf{Rep}$	representation pre-stack	Eqn (2.18)	6
$\mathcal{N}_\omega$	null-space associated to ω	Eqn (3.5)	7
$\mathcal{H}_\omega$	Hilbert space associated to ω via GNS	Eqn (3.9)	8
$[a]$	typical elements of $\mathcal{H}_\omega$	Eqn (3.10)	8
π_ω	representation associated to ω via GNS	Eqn (3.12)	8
$\mathbf{GNS}_{\mathcal{A}}$	GNS construction for $\mathcal{A}$	Con 3.1	7–8
$\mathbf{GNS}_f$	GNS construction for $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$	Con 3.14	9–10
$\mathbf{GNS}$	the GNS construction	Thm 3.22	11
Ω	unit vector (occasionally cyclic)	Def'n 5.1	14
$(\pi, \mathcal{H}, \Omega)$	pointed (or cyclic) representation	Def'n 5.1	14
$\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet(\mathcal{A})$	category of pointed representations of $\mathcal{A}$	Def'n 5.4	14
$\mathbf{Rep}^\odot(\mathcal{A})$	category of cyclic representations of $\mathcal{A}$	Def'n 5.4	14
$\mathbf{rest}_{\mathcal{A}}$	restriction to states on $\mathcal{A}$ functor	Con 5.10	15
$\mathbf{Rep}^\bullet$	pointed representation pre-stack	Con 5.20	16
$\mathbf{rest}_f$	restriction to states for $\mathcal{A}' \xrightarrow{f} \mathcal{A}$	Con 5.20	16
$\mathbf{rest}$	restriction natural transformation	Prop 5.23	16
$\mathbf{GNS}^\bullet$	pointed GNS construction	Thm 5.33	18
m	GNS modification	Lem 5.57	21

References

[1] I. Gelfand and M. Neumark, "On the imbedding of normed rings into the ring of operators in Hilbert space," *Rec. Math. [Mat. Sbornik] N.S.* **12(54)** (1943) 197–213.

[2] I. E. Segal, "Irreducible representations of operator algebras," *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **53** (1947) 73–88.

[3] S. Mac Lane, *Categories for the working mathematician*, vol. 5 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, second ed., 1998.

[4] J. Dixmier, *C^*-algebras*. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York-Oxford, 1977. Translated from the French by Francis Jellett, North-Holland Mathematical Library, Vol. 15.

[5] E. T. Jaynes, "Information Theory and Statistical Mechanics," *Phys. Rev.* **106** (1957) 620–630.

[6] B. C. Hall, *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and representations*, vol. 222 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, second ed., 2015.

[7] A. P. Balachandran, T. R. Govindarajan, A. R. de Quieroz, and A. F. Reyes-Lega, "Entanglement, Particle Identity and the GNS Construction: A Unifying Approach," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 080503, arXiv:1303.0688 [hep-th].

[8] B. C. Hall, *Quantum theory for mathematicians*, vol. 267 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, New York, 2013.

[9] R. M. Wald, *Quantum field theory in curved spacetime and black hole thermodynamics*. Chicago Lectures in Physics. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 1994.

[10] J.-L. Brylinski, *Loop spaces, characteristic classes and geometric quantization*. Modern Birkhäuser Classics. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 2008. Reprint of the 1993 edition.

[11] J. Bénabou, "Introduction to bicategories," in *Reports of the Midwest Category Seminar*, pp. 1–77. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 1967.

[12] J. C. Baez and J. Dolan, "From finite sets to Feynman diagrams," in *Mathematics unlimited—2001 and beyond*, pp. 29–50. Springer, Berlin, 2001. math/0004133.

Mathematics Department, University of Connecticut, Storrs, CT 06269, USA, *Email:* arthur.parzygnat@uconn.edu